

## PANCHADASHI (SECTION III-29)

Satvatvam baadhaaraahityam jagatbaadhaika saakshinah

Baadhah kim saakshiko vruhi na tva saakshika ishyate

Explanation By Pandit Sri Durgacharan Chattopadyay (Udbodhan- 1940  
MAY)

The Word 'WITNESS' also present in

SECTION I-38 [38. In the dreaming state, consciousness belonging to the gross physical body the receptacle of food (hence foodful) is absent, but the **Atma** is not wanting in manifestibility.

He is **present as a witness** even here and such a condition is termed 'Anvaya' or connection as cause and effect.

[The oft quoted example of 'I knew nothing' is a trite example. Here the phrase signifies that all consciousness is at an end, but then the knowledge of such a condition is itself an experience of a certain amount of consciousness, otherwise for one to say on waking that he knew nothing while asleep will be impossible. Now this signifies that the mind in its ordinary state is a double combination of Atma plus mind, we are so in rich in the enjoyment of this twin medley, that its least disturbance as in fits, or trance where the mind sleeps, or in the dreaming condition when the mind ceases to receive the reflection of the Atma, full of intelligence, we say we know nothing, here the literal condition of the Atma continues as active as ever, it is only the mind that is cut off from the influence of receiving the reflected intelligence which is its habitual wont. The Atma is a witness of what the mind fails to perceive and such a condition is what is meant by the term just used,] while that other condition in which the active manifestibility of the Atma continues in the absence of consciousness in the gross physical body [i. e., the consciousness of the gross body disappears in spite of the presence of Self] is called Vyatireka or dissimilitude. By these two methods the Atma is clearly discernible to be quite a separate thing from the gross physical body, the foodful sheath.]

SECTION I-41 [41. Now are to be explained for the purpose of ascertaining the non-identity of the cause-body with the Spirit, its Anvaya and Vyatrieka in the state of the profound meditation

(Samadhi) , for such a consideration the blissful sheath or the cause-body, though it shakes of its coil of ignorance, yet the tangibility of the Spirit as a witness is of the first, while the continuance of ignorance, notwithstanding the presence of the Spirit, is an instance of the second.]

SECTION II-40 [40. If you say, during such meditation, existence is not conceivable, for the separate function of the internal organ is at abeyance, and it cannot cover the Brahma. Our reply is, for discovering the Brahma the presence of Boodhi is not needed. For, It is self-illuminated and requires no other extraneous aid for being discovered. Though not a subject of Boodhi (spiritual intelligence) yet it is duly reflected in the consciousness, as a witness, a presence not to be put by, a real existence, and not an unreal nothing.

SECTION II-41 [41. Therefore after the mind has been freed from its subjective modifications of determination and [error, mistake,or] indecision and has attained tranquility, as its associated consciousness is manifested in the form of a simple presence, or witness, doing nothing, but in a condition of passivity, so that prior condition when it existed before the objective world had sprung into existence through Matter (Maya) is easily conceivable and implies neither any difficulty nor contradiction.]

SECTION III-22,

SECTION XIV- 57 [“I am the witnessing intelligence” I do nothing nor make others do.]

37. The theosophist thus sings of his being the all-self

as in the text of the Sama Veda : &quot;I am the food as well as its enjoyer.&quot;\*

\* He enjoys the blissfulness of heaven quite disinterestedly without expressing any wish or longing for it, but as the witnessing intelligence prevailing everywhere. This is the purport of the Sruti text.

36. If it be contended, that as ignorant persons are similar witnesses, they also can be said to enjoy all manner of happiness. That is impossible. For the knowledge that am the witness in all intellects seated inside all bodies&quot; is absent in them. As the Sruti says : &quot;Who knows [each individuated self to be Brahma] enjoys all happiness.&quot;

35. Just as he experiences happiness in his own body, for being the witness of the modification of intellect assuming the shape of happiness ; so for a similar witness of the same modification of intellect in others too, he enjoys happiness.

## SECTION XII- 76

then

the question is, whether that non-distinction of Intelligence and bliss exists in the witness (Self), or elsewhere in the modifications of associate ? [This is for the dissenter to answer.]

71. One who worships the witnessing Intelligence, knowing that to be his dearest self, never experiences any path ; as happens to men holding wife, son, and temporal enjoyments dear, when they die or disappear.

62. A theosophist says

&quot; of all visible objects Self is the

But ignorant persons say, son, wife, etc., are the

dearest, and the witness (Self) for the sake of enjoying them is

dear.

57. If the purport of the Srutbe duly considered, it will be found, that the witnessing Intelligence alone is Self, And that due consideration consists in discriminating the five sheaths foodful and the rest and things subordinate to or included in them, and ascertaining their difference from Self ; what is internal to them is Self. In this manner to know him by inference is meant by the verb to consider.

48.

" I am bound and will try to be freed." [When a person possessed of the four means of knowledge is desirous of release, then by the help of the preceptor and the sacred writings as to the signification of the transcendental phrase " That art Thou," he obtains visible knowledge of his oneness with BRAHMA, discards the idea of his being an agent and instrument, and exclaims " I am BRAHMA."] Here it is proper to connect the witness with pure Intelligence and not the cognitional and other sheaths. In the Sruti, Self is spoken of as BRAHMA thus :

" BRAHMA is knowledge and bliss."

" Self is

infinite, internal, perfect, and full of knowledge."

44. [Accordingly we find] in the case of a person in death.bed, his son, wife, etc., appear as the proper parties to look after the house and property and they are his secondary self; because they are desirous of surviving him : but neither the witness (real Self) nor the physical body (unreal Self) are fit for such work, inasmuch as the former is unchangeable, and have no desire, while the latter in confronting death is reduced to helplessness ; consequently son and the rest appear as the principal self.

*Eko Devo Sarvabhooteshu Goodah Sarva vyapee Sarvabhootantaraatma  
Karmadhyakshah Sarvabhutadhivaasah **Saakshi Cheta Kevalo**  
**Nirgunascha.** (Svet. Up. 6.11)*

In the mantra, sakshi cheta kevalo nirgunascha, the word sakshi [witness] must be understood as sannidhi [presence], without which there could be nothing. See how the sun is necessary for daily activities. He does not however form part of the world actions; yet they cannot take place without the sun. He is the witness of the activities. So it is with the Self. (Talks with Sri Ramana Maharshi, talk no. 466) Bhagavan: Talking of the 'witness' should not lead to the idea that there is a witness and something else apart from him that he is witnessing. The 'witness' really means the light that illumines the seer, the seen and the process of seeing. Before, during and after the triads of seer, seen and seeing, the illumination exists. It alone exists always. (Day by Day with Bhagavan, 18th July, 1946)<sup>99</sup> The world does not exist without the body; the body never at any time exists without the mind; the mind does not exist at all apart from consciousness; and consciousness too does not exist apart from being.

The spectator I is the pure Self, pure Consciousness, Atman , the Silent Observer or the sheer Witness -- sakshi cheta kevalo nirgunascha.

The idea is given in a nutshell in **Drgdrsyaviveka** verse 1- —Colors (*roopam*) are perceived by the eye and the eye is their perceiver. It (the eye) is perceived and the mind is its perceiver. The mind with its modifications is perceived and the Witness (sakshi, i.e., the atma) is verily the perceiver. But it (the sakshi) is not perceived by any other. (*roopam drsyam locanam drk tat-drsyam drktu maanasam; drsyaa dhii-vrittaya-saaakshii drgeva na drsyate*).

**Kenopanishad**

One approach is to say that Brahman cannot be known means that Brahman cannot be known as an object but there are methods by which we are made to recognize Brahman. No one will deny that he exists as a conscious being. Initially, one may mistake the mind as one's true nature, but when a constant "I" is invoked as the same entity witnessing the changing conditions of the mind, one recognizes the ultimate sakshi. And "knowing Brahman" means that from the study of Sastra, we have to understand that the sakshi is none other than the Brahma caitanyam. In effect, the Existence and Consciousness aspect of Brahman is self-evident but the Infinity aspect, we have to learn from Sastra. In his commentary on Brhadaranyaka Upanishad IV.iv.19, Sankaracarya interprets 'manasaa eva' in 'manasaa eva anudrashtavyam' as 'purified by the knowledge of the supreme Truth and in accordance with the instructions of the teacher'. And in his commentary on IV.iv.20, he interprets 'apramayam' as 'Unlike a thing being known by another, Brahman is the One only; hence It is unknowable.' How to recognize Brahman without knowing It as an object is stated in **Kenopanishad II.4** - "Being the witness of all cognitions and, by nature, being nothing but Consciousness, Brahman is indicated by the cognitions themselves, in the midst of cognitions, as pervading all of them. ("Pratibodhaviditam matam"). Kenopanishad 1.4 says that That (Brahman) is different from the known and, again, It is different from the unknown". Sankaracarya explains, "The known is very much within the grasp of the act of knowing, that which is the object of the verb 'to know'. Inasmuch as everything is known somewhere, by somebody, all that is manifested ('vyaakrtam' is certainly known. The idea is that Brahman is different from that. But it should be taken to be unknown, the Upanishad says, [anyat eva tat viditat atho aviditat adhi] 'Again, It is different from the unknown'. 'From the unknown' means 'from what is opposed to the known'. The reference is to that which consists of the unmanifested avidya which is the seed of the manifested. (Thus it boils down to Brahman being different from the evolved as well as the unevolved nama roopa).

**Vedanta Paribhasa**

That perception is again two fold – that due to the witness in the individual self (jiva-sakshin) and that due to the witness of God (Isvara Sakshin). Now the **individual self** is the Consciousness **limited by the mind**, and the **witness** in that is the Consciousness that has the **mind as its limiting adjunct**. The difference between them is that in the former the mind is a qualifying attribute and in the latter a limiting adjunct. A qualifying attribute is that which differentiates, is present, and is connected with (what is predicated in respect of) something related to it while a limiting adjunct is that which differentiates and is present but is not connected with the predicate in respect of something related to it. In the sentence, “The colored jar is transitory”, the color is a qualifying attribute, and in the sentence, “The ether enclosed by the auditory passage is the ear”. The auditory passage is a limiting adjunct. It is this limiting adjunct that is called an indicator (paricayaka) by the logicians. In the topic under consideration, since the mind is insentient and hence incapable of revealing objects, it is a limiting adjunct of Consciousness, which reveals things. **This witness in the individual self is different in each individual**. For if it were one, what Chaitra has known, Maitra also would recollect.

**Brahma Sutra (Adhyaasa Bhaashya) Class 10 (11.10.91) Sw Mokshadananda**

"Id YddSd«de±fd e!dSd«dZ . . . H®d«de®dèÕZ §d,£Sd>dd£«d!Sd§Sd!dd£«dd¥Sdd±dZ |" This sentence we have to study now. The question was raised that how on this Pratyagatman, the innermost Self, which is never the object, upon that how these object as antahkarana, mind, sense etc. are superimposed? How can they be superimposed? The reason was given—"±d®ddy%o eUµ §dgTdyí®de± ædfdy . . . ©d,®dfe°d |" Now that question first can be understood in this way, that this Atman is not known at all. That means it never becomes

in any way the object of our understanding, in general —  $\pm dd \ll dd | Sd f d Z$ , and the question can be in another way that since the  $A \neq Sdd \pm d$ , the superimposition, is always found on a thing, upon a thing, which is an object of perception and which is visible in front of us, that means, which is visible. Nothing can be superimposed upon that which is **not visible**. On a visible thing can something be superimposed, some other things, that means, some other feature, some other substance can be superimposed.

Now one point is to be noted here, that nothing can be superimposed on something which is not really perceived. This is a condition, that superimposition is possible, can be only upon something **which is visible**, which is **perceptible**, which **is known**, otherwise how can we superimpose?

So if we try to analyse the answer he has given, we find that akasha is not really  $A \neq Sd f d$ , it is  $\neq Sd f d$ , but not by our external senses, i.e. organs, nor by our internal sense, that means this  $A | f d Z I \eta T P d$ , mind. It is not perceived by the mind or the senses, i.e.  $\ddot{Y} d' d g T d e Q$ , yet it is  $\neq Sd f d$ . That is, according to  $A \ddot{U} z f d e \pm d \ddot{O} d | f d$ —the view that is held, that is conclusive in nature— $e \pm d \ddot{O} d | f d$ , that akasha is  $\neq Sd f d$  but not by any of our organs, neither external nor internal, but it is  $\pm dd' d f \ll dd \hat{I} d$ , that means, it is directly revealed, revealed means, it becomes  $\neq Sd f d$  by the  $\pm dd' d f$ ,  $\pm dd' d f$  is the  $\neq Sd \gg dd f \ll d | d \check{S}$  itself, without any  $D \neq d d e \neq d$ , that means without the  $D \neq d d e \neq d$  of the  $A | f d Z I \eta T P d$ .

Of course,  $\pm dd' d f$ , when we give this name to this  $\neg d g \ddot{O} \odot d, \hat{a} d | d \check{S}$ , then it is  $\pm d d y \neq d d e \neq d | \eta$ , it is conditioned, not that it is totally unconditioned, it is conditioned by  $A | f d Z I \eta T P d$  definitely, ..... upon the  $\pm dd' d f$ , the  $\neq Sd \gg dd f \ll d | d \check{S}$ , the  $A | f d Z I \eta T P d$  is superimposed. That superimposition of the  $A | f d Z I \eta T P d$  is in the  $e \pm d \ddot{O} d | f d$ ,



[Avachhedaka and Upaadhi are two different terms] It is understood in two ways, one as  $e@d^{-}dy^{\circ}dPd$ ,  $\$d,I\|dT$ ,  $A@d\ddot{Y}jy\mu QI\|$ , and the other as  $D\$dde\forall d$ .

When we say  **$e@d^{-}dy^{\circ}dPd$** , it actually limits it, in a way as real,

and when  $D\$dde\forall d$ , it is absolutely free from that. Though it becomes limited in our understanding but the thing remains absolutely untouched by any condition.

$D\$dde\forall d$  is a condition, but it is really absolutely free.

So this  $\pm dd'df$ , when we say in Advaita Vedanta  $\pm dd'df\ll dd\hat{I}d$  it means revealed by this  $\pm dd'df$ .

Who is  $\pm dd'df$ ? **The  $\neg dg\ddot{O}@d,\hat{a}d\ddot{I}d\check{S}$  is  $\pm dd'df$** . When it becomes limited by the  $A\ddot{I}fdZI\|TPd$  as  $D\$dde\forall d$ , limited in the sense only in our understanding; but really it is absolutely aloof, because  $D\$dde\forall d$  is not in anyway in contact with it.

Example may be like this: say a crystal [is there] and a red flower is near it. That crystal looks red because of this  $D\$dde\forall d$  near it, but it is not really red. It was never red but looks to us as red. The reflection of that redness in the crystal we see, but the crystal is ever crystal and it is transparent,  $\neg dg^{\text{TM}}\neg d$ , yet it appears as red. So such is the case.

So this antahkarana, when it is understood as  $D\$dde\forall d$ , it limits, it conditions, and it becomes sakshi, then we call it sakshi.

Sakshi—this word means which perceives directly— $\pm dd'dd\text{f}d\check{S}$   $Q^{-}d\%ef d \pm da\ddot{e}ddSdd\ll d\check{S}$ . There is a sutra in the Paninian grammer. He gives this rule, he actually gives the finished word to us— $\pm dd'dd\text{f}d\check{S}$   $Q^{-}d\%Sdef d \pm da\ddot{e}ddSdd\ll d\check{S}$ . The word sakshi becomes, that means  $\pm dd'dd\text{f}d\check{S}$   $Qm\acute{Y}$ , without the help of any means of knowledge, it sees. As for instance  $\$d,\text{f}Sd'd$ ,  $A\ddot{I}dg\ll dd\ddot{I}d$ ,  $D\$d\ll dd\ddot{I}d$ ,  $A\ddot{x}dd\%\$de\ddot{I}d$ —no means of knowledge is in service, without any services rendered from

these means it knows directly, that means the thing becomes revealed to us, we become aware of that.

That is called sakshi and ±dd´df«ddîd. Sakshi is "he", or that thing, which without the help of any means of knowledge can reveal a thing.

That means **a thing is revealed to it and then later on we become aware of that through our antahkarana [which] is the A@dŸJµQI¶ of that chaitanya, i.e. the §d,£Sd>dd£«d;dŠ.**

Class 11

When the mind acts as a determinant, as an attribute, then men become this individual jiva,

and when it is only D§dde¥d then it is sakshi,

this is the difference. §d,«dd£dd and sakshi,

§d,«dd£dd is the jiva; sakshi is also so but it is a little different. §d,«dd£dd experiences happiness, unhappiness, all those things, but sakshi is only a witness, the observer.

So that is the difference. [Sakshi is the witness] because of its uninvolved nature and §d,«dd£dd becomes involved.

It [Aakaasha] is therefore not A§d,£Sd´d strictly, it is §d,£Sd´d, but not §d,£Sd´d by this individual jiva, with the help of his mind and the senses.